## NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

# IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

C.V.,

Petitioner.

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF MERCED COUNTY,

Respondent;

MERCED COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY,

Real Party in Interest.

F058946

(Super. Ct. No. JP000070)

**OPINION** 

# **THE COURT\***

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS; petition for extraordinary writ review. Harry L. Jacobs, Commissioner.

C.V., in pro. per., for Petitioner.

No appearance for Respondent.

James N. Fincher, County Counsel, and James B. Tarhalla, Deputy County Counsel, for Real Party in Interest.

-00O00-

<sup>\*</sup>Before Cornell, Acting P.J., Gomes, J., and Dawson, J.

Petitioner in propria persona seeks an extraordinary writ (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.452 (rule 8.452)) from respondent court's orders issued at a contested dispositional hearing denying her reunification services and setting a Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.26<sup>1</sup> hearing as to her son A. We conclude her petition fails to comport with the procedural requirements of rule 8.452. Accordingly, we will dismiss the petition as facially inadequate.

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

In August 2009, newborn A. was released into the custody of the Merced County Human Services Agency because the previous May his half-brother, J., was severely abused by petitioner and J.'s stepfather (also A.'s father). In September 2009, the juvenile court adjudged J. a dependent of the court and denied petitioner reunification services as to him. Upon his release from the hospital, A. was placed with J. in foster care.

In October 2009, the juvenile court sustained allegations petitioner's severe abuse and neglect of J. placed A. at similar risk and, in November 2009, following a contested dispositional hearing, denied her reunification services pursuant to section 361.5, subdivision (b)(6) and (7).<sup>2</sup> The court also denied A.'s father reunification services<sup>3</sup> and set a section 366.26 hearing to implement a permanent plan. This petition ensued.

All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>2</sup> Section 361.5, subdivision (b)(6) and (7) provides in relevant part:

<sup>&</sup>quot;(b) Reunification services need not be provided to a parent ... described in this subdivision when the court finds, by clear and convincing evidence, any of the following: [¶] ... [¶] (6) That the child has been adjudicated a dependent pursuant to any subdivision of Section 300 as a result of ... the infliction of severe physical harm to the child, a sibling, or a half sibling by a parent ..., and the court makes a factual finding that it would not benefit the child to pursue reunification services with the offending parent .... [¶]

#### DISCUSSION

Rule 8.452 requires that a dependency writ petition include a memorandum setting forth a summary of the significant facts and points of contention supported by argument and citation to the appellate record and authority. (Rule 8.452(b).)

Here, the petition consists of the standard Judicial Council of California form for filing an extraordinary writ petition (JV-825). The petition is blank except for the basic information required (i.e., name, address and juvenile court case number). In that an extraordinary writ petition requires at least some allegation of juvenile court error in order for us to review the matter, the instant petition is completely inadequate for review. Accordingly, we will dismiss the petition as facially deficient.

#### **DISPOSITION**

The petition for extraordinary writ is dismissed. This opinion is final forthwith as to this court.

<sup>... [¶] (7)</sup> That the parent is not receiving reunification services for a sibling or a half sibling of the child pursuant to paragraph (3), (5), or (6)."

The father did not file a writ petition.